

Baltimore and upper counties. No change in representation was advocated by others.

How do we now stand? A portion of each of those extremes have yielded something of their ultra views.

Mr. J. said, without this, no Constitution could be framed—with a proper spirit of compromise. It may be done.

In this he admired the course of his friend from the city of Baltimore, (Mr. Prestman,) and others, who although believing they were entitled to a larger number, had voted for ten delegates for Baltimore city, and six from the largest counties—so had gentlemen from the smaller counties, and why? Because neither extreme could carry out their views, and some intermediate system must be resorted to, in which course Mr. J. had no doubt they would be sustained by their respective constituents. And he would here remark, that if such a constitution as would be accepted by the people, is not adopted, it will be justly attributable to the extremes of which the reformers, *par excellence*, will be most responsible. Mr. J. said, he came here as a Reformer, but not to the extent required by some. He would not say as others had, that they would vote for no Constitution, which did not embody their particular views. He would not say that he would reject any plan because his constituents might prefer some other.

He would go for none that compromised their interests. But he would not reject a Constitution because all they desired could not be obtained. Even the gentleman from Carroll, (Mr. Brown,) had yielded to what he considered the best alternative—a compromise. So the gentleman from the city of Baltimore, (Mr. Brew,) who although claiming for Baltimore twenty-eight to thirty, was willing to compromise in certain contingencies, to take twelve, or double the number of the largest county.

It then becomes our duty, and certainly is our best policy, to meet them as far as we can go. Of one thing Mr. J. felt confident, which was that in any Convention hereafter to be held, to alter or frame a Constitution—the smaller counties never will have so favorable a representation as in the present. They are now represented, under the present Constitution framed by themselves, as their relative numbers entitle them to the Legislature of the State. Their interest, in preparing a Constitution such as may be ratified by the people, is equal to that of any portion of the State. An adherence to ultra views to defeat it, will recoil upon themselves.

Mr. J. said, he regretted that much had been said to array one portion of the State against another, by drawingvidious comparisons between the city of Baltimore and the counties. This he considered entirely out of place and productive of no good to either. There interests in many respects are different, but not necessarily antagonistic.

Each can move in its respective sphere smoothly and prosperously, without prejudice to the other; indeed in perfect harmony and mutual benefit. No part of the State should be looked to exclusively, as being independent or indifferent

to the other; all had a common interest in the prosperity of every portion of it; hence our duty so to frame a Constitution to protect the whole. For himself he should endeavor to adopt the course most likely to effect that object. Mr. J. said, he would analyze the three plans referred to, and which he considered as a basis upon which a compromise might be agreed on. These are, the one of the gentleman from Anne Arundel, (Mr. Dorsey,) the one of the gentleman from Washington, (Mr. Fiery,) and the one of the gentleman from Kent, (Mr. Chambers,) being the report of the minority of the committee appointed on the subject of representation. The two latter have been rejected, but stand under motions to reconsider, whilst the former is the immediate bill before the Convention.

They propose that the House of Delegates shall consist of 83, of 73, and of 88 members, apportioned as follows:

	Dorsey.	Fiery.	Chambers.
Allegany county,	4	4	4
Baltimore county,	6	6	6
Baltimore city,	10	10	6
Carroll,	4	3	4
Frederick,	6	6	6
Harford,	3	3	4
Cecil,	3	3	4
Washington,	5	5	5
Howard,	3	2	3
	44	42	42
Anne Arundel,	4	3	4
Caroline,	2	2	3
Calvert,	2	2	3
Montgomery,	3	2	4
Dorchester,	3	3	4
Charles,	3	2	4
Kent,	2	2	3
Prince George's,	4	3	4
Queen Anne,	3	2	3
St. Mary's,	3	2	3
Somerset,	4	3	4
Talbot,	3	2	3
Worcester,	3	3	3
	39	31	46
Total,	83	73	88

Mr. J. said he did not know that the question of the slave holding counties proper, as contrasted with those less interested in that species of property, had been taken into consideration by either of the gentlemen who had submitted these plans, nor would he now advert to it, had not some reference been made to it, both in and out of the Convention. This had induced him to turn his attention to the subject and to analyze the several propositions. Upon comparing the representation as proposed, the result was that in the House of Delegates hereafter, the eight counties, with the city of Baltimore, least interested in that property, would have by

Judge Dorsey's plan	44	members out of	83
Mr. Fiery's	42	"	73
Judge Chambers's	42	"	88